

# NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE USSR

CONSULATE GENERAL  
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS  
2790 GREEN ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123

January 16, 1986

## STATEMENT BY MIKHAIL GORBACHEV

Moscow. January 15. TASS. The following is the full text of a statement by General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) Mikhail Gorbachev:

The new year 1986 has started to elapse. It will be an important year, one can say a turning point in the history of the Soviet state, the year of the Twenty-seventh Congress of the CPSU. The Congress will chart the guidelines for the political, social, economic and spiritual development of Soviet society in the period up to the next millennium. It will adopt a program for accelerating our peaceful construction.

{ All efforts of the CPSU are directed toward ensuring a further improvement in the life of the Soviet people.

A turn for the better is also needed in the international arena. This is the expectation and the demand of the peoples of the Soviet Union and of peoples throughout the world.

Being aware of this, at the start of the new year the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government have adopted a decision on a number of major foreign policy actions of a fundamental nature. They are designed to promote to a maximum degree an improvement in the international situation. They are prompted by the need to overcome the negative, confrontational trends that have been growing in recent years and to clear the ways toward curbing the nuclear arms race on Earth and preventing it in outer space, toward an overall reduction of the risk of war and trust building as an integral part of relations among states.

### I.

Our most important action is a concrete program aimed at the complete elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world and covering a precisely defined period of time.

(more)

question  
beginning of  
Phase III

The Soviet Union is proposing a step-by-step and consistent process of ridding the Earth of nuclear weapons, to be implemented and completed within the next fifteen years, before the end of this century.

The twentieth century has given humanity the gift of the energy of the atom. However, this great achievement of the human mind can turn into an instrument of the self-annihilation of the human race.

Is it possible to solve this contradiction? We are convinced it is. Finding effective ways toward eliminating nuclear weapons is a feasible task, provided it is tackled without delay. yes

The Soviet Union is proposing a program of ridding humankind of the fear of a nuclear catastrophe, to be carried out beginning in 1986. And the fact that this year has been proclaimed by the United Nations the International Year of Peace provides an additional political and moral incentive for this. What is required here is rising above national selfishness, tactical calculations, differences and disputes, whose significance is nothing compared to the preservation of what is most valuable--peace and a safe future. The energy of the atom should be placed at the exclusive service of peace, a goal that our socialist state has invariably advocated and continues to pursue.

It was our country that as early as 1946 was the first to raise the question of prohibiting the production and use of atomic weapons and to make atomic energy serve peaceful purposes for the benefit of humanity.

How does the Soviet Union envisage today in practical terms the process of reducing nuclear weapons, both delivery vehicles and warheads, leading to their complete elimination? Our proposals can be summarized as follows.

Research?  
yes  
on either  
side

Stage One. Within the next five to eight years the USSR and the USA will reduce by one half the nuclear arms that can reach each other's territory. On the remaining delivery vehicles of this kind each side will retain no more than 6,000 warheads. Heavy missiles? (SALT-II rules; (DS missiles? NO NEW MIRV MISSILES!  
Ratio of warheads to landings?

It stands to reason that such a reduction is possible only if the USSR and the USA mutually renounce the development, testing and deployment of space strike weapons. As the Soviet Union has repeatedly warned, the development of space strike weapons will dash the hopes for a reduction of nuclear weapons on Earth. ABM  
SALT

yes.  
again?

The first stage will include the adoption and implementation of the decision on the complete elimination of intermediate-range missiles of the USSR and the USA in the European zones, both ballistic and cruise missiles, as a first step toward ridding the European continent of nuclear weapons.

At the same time the United States should undertake not to transfer its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries, while Great Britain and France should pledge not to build up their respective nuclear arms.

must?  
(at outset?)  
(7, say, in  
1989?

The USSR and the USA should from the very beginning agree to stop any nuclear explosions and call upon other states to join in such a moratorium as soon as possible.

We propose that the first stage of nuclear disarmament should concern the Soviet Union and the United States because it is up to them to set an example for

(more)



the other nuclear powers to follow. We said that very frankly to President Reagan of the United States during our meeting in Geneva.

Stage Two. At this stage, which should start no later than 1990 and last for five to seven years, the other nuclear powers will begin to engage in nuclear disarmament. To begin with, they would pledge to freeze all their nuclear arms and not to have them in the territories of other countries.

In this period the USSR and the USA will go on with the reductions agreed upon during the first stage and also carry out further measures designed to eliminate their medium-range nuclear weapons and freeze their tactical nuclear systems.

Following the completion by the USSR and the USA of the fifty percent reduction in their relevant arms at the second stage, another radical step is taken: All nuclear powers eliminate their tactical nuclear arms, namely the weapons having a range (or radius of action) of up to 1,000 kilometers. At the same stage the Soviet-American accord on the prohibition of space strike weapons would have to become multilateral, with the mandatory participation of major industrial powers in it.

All nuclear powers would stop nuclear-weapons tests.

There would be a ban on the development of nonnuclear weapons based on new physical principles, whose destructive capacity is close to that of nuclear arms or other weapons of mass destruction.

*Further  
revisions*  
Stage three will begin no later than 1995. At this stage the elimination of all remaining nuclear weapons will be completed. By the end of 1999 there will be no nuclear weapons on Earth. A universal accord will be drawn up that such weapons should never again come into being.

We have in mind that special procedures will be worked out for the destruction of nuclear weapons as well as the dismantling, re-equipment or destruction of delivery vehicles. In the process, agreement will be reached on the numbers of weapons to be destroyed at each stage, the sites of their destruction and so on.

Verification with regard to the weapons that are destroyed or limited would be carried out both by national technical means and through on-site inspections. The USSR is ready to reach agreement on any other additional verification measures.

The adoption of the nuclear disarmament program that we propose would undoubtedly have a favorable impact on the negotiations conducted at bilateral and multilateral forums. The program would identify specific routes and reference points, establish a specific time-frame for achieving agreements and implementing them and would make the negotiations purposeful and goal oriented. This would break the dangerous trend whereby the momentum of the arms race is greater than the process of negotiations.

*without SDI;  
not "on path  
to SDI."*  
In summary, we propose that we should enter the Third Millennium without nuclear weapons, on the basis of mutually acceptable and strictly verifiable agreements. If the United States Administration is indeed committed to the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere, as it has repeatedly stated, it is being offered a practical opportunity to begin this in practice. Instead of wasting the next ten to fifteen years by developing new, extremely dangerous weapons in space, allegedly designed to make nuclear arms useless, would it not be more sensible to start eliminating those arms and finally bring them down to zero?

(more)

*Foreign D-L cap.*

*Foreign FU threats cap.*

*"stable, restricted deterrence"*



The Soviet Union, I repeat, proposes precisely that.

The Soviet Union calls upon all peoples and states and, naturally, above all nuclear states, to support the program of eliminating nuclear weapons before the year 2000. It is absolutely clear to any unbiased person that if such a program is implemented, nobody would lose and everybody stands to gain. This is a problem common to all mankind and it can and must be solved only through common efforts. And the sooner this program is translated into practical deeds, the safer life will be on our planet.

II

Guided by the same approach and the desire to make another practical step within the context of the program of nuclear disarmament, the Soviet Union has taken an important decision.

We are extending by three months our unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions, which expired on December 31, 1985. Such a moratorium will remain in effect even further if the United States for its part also stops nuclear tests. We propose once again to the United States to join this initiative, whose significance is evident to practically everyone in the world.

It is clear that adopting such a decision was by no means simple for us. The Soviet Union cannot display unilateral restraint with regard to nuclear tests indefinitely. But the stakes are too high and the responsibility too great for us not to try every possibility of influencing the position of others through the force of example.

BUT  
X-ray beam  
All experts, scientists, politicians and military men agree that the cessation of tests would indeed block off the channels for upgrading nuclear weapons. And this task has top priority. A reduction of nuclear arsenals alone, without a prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests, does not offer a way out of the dilemma of nuclear danger, since the remaining weapons would be modernized and there would still remain the possibility of developing increasingly sophisticated and lethal nuclear weapons and evaluating their new types at test ranges.

Therefore, the cessation of tests is a practical step toward eliminating nuclear weapons.

LY T 188?  
I wish to say the following from the outset. Possible references to verification as an obstacle to the establishment of a moratorium on nuclear explosions would be totally groundless. We declare unequivocally that verification is no problem, so far as we are concerned. Should the United States agree to stop all nuclear explosions on a reciprocal basis, appropriate verification of compliance with the moratorium would be fully ensured by national technical means as well as through international procedures--including on-site inspections whenever necessary. We invite the United States to reach agreement to this effect.

The USSR is strongly in favor of the moratorium becoming a bilateral, and later a multilateral action. We are also in favor of resuming the trilateral negotiations involving the USSR, the USA and Great Britain on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests. This could be done immediately, even this month. We are also prepared to begin without delay multilateral test ban negotiations within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, with all nuclear powers taking part.

Nonaligned countries are proposing consultations with a view to making the 1963 Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water apply also to the underground tests, which are not covered by the

(more)



Treaty. The Soviet Union is agreeable to this measure too.

Since last summer we have been calling upon the United States to follow our example and stop nuclear explosions. Washington has as yet not done that despite the protests and demands of public opinion, and contrary to the will of most states in the world. By continuing to set off nuclear explosions the U.S. side continues to pursue its elusive dream of military superiority. This policy is futile and dangerous, a policy which is not worthy of the level of civilization that modern society has reached.

In the absence of a positive response from the United States, the Soviet side had every right to resume nuclear tests starting already on January 1, 1986. If one were to follow the usual "logic" of the arms race, that, presumably, would have been the thing to do.

But the point is that it is precisely that notorious logic that has to be resolutely repudiated. We are making yet another attempt in this direction. Otherwise the process of military rivalry will become an avalanche and any control over the course of events would be impossible. To submit to the force of the nuclear arms race is inadmissible. This would mean acting against the voice of reason and the human instinct of self-preservation. What is required are new and bold approaches, a new political thinking and a heightened sense of responsibility for the destinies of the peoples of the world.

The U.S. Administration is once again given more time to weigh our proposals on stopping nuclear explosions and to give a positive answer to them. It is precisely this kind of response that people everywhere in the world will expect from Washington.

The Soviet Union is addressing an appeal to the United States President and Congress, to the American people. There is an opportunity for halting the process of upgrading nuclear arms and developing new weapons of that kind. It must not be missed. The Soviet proposals place the USSR and the United States in an equal position. These proposals do not attempt to outwit or outsmart the other side. We are proposing to take the road of sensible and responsible decisions.

### III.

In order to implement the program of reducing and eliminating nuclear arsenals, the entire existing system of negotiations has to be set in motion and the highest possible efficiency of disarmament machinery ensured.

In a few days the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms will resume in Geneva. When we met with President Reagan last November at Geneva, we had a frank discussion on the whole range of problems that constitute the subject of those negotiations, namely on space, strategic offensive arms and intermediate-range nuclear systems. It was agreed that the negotiations should be accelerated and that agreement must not remain a mere declaration.

The Soviet delegation in Geneva will be instructed to act in strict compliance with that agreement. We expect the same constructive approach from the U.S. side, above all on the question of space. Space must remain peaceful. Strike weapons should not be deployed there. Neither should they be developed. And let there also be a most rigorous control, including opening the relevant laboratories for inspection.

Humanity is at a crucial stage of the new space age. And it is time to abandon the thinking of the Stone Age, when the chief concern was to have a bigger

(more)



stick or a heavier stone. We are against weapons in space. Our material and intellectual capabilities make it possible for the Soviet Union to develop any weapon if we are compelled to do this. But we are fully aware of our responsibility to the present and future generations. It is our profound conviction that we should approach the Third Millennium not with the "Star Wars" program but with large-scale projects of peaceful exploration of space by all humankind. We propose to start practical work on such projects and their implementation. This is one of the major ways of ensuring progress on our entire planet and establishing a reliable system of security for all.

To prevent the arms race from extending into space means to remove the obstacle to deep cuts in nuclear weapons. There is on the negotiating table in Geneva a Soviet proposal on reducing by one half the relevant nuclear arms of the Soviet Union and the United States, which would be an important step toward a complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Barring the possibility of resolving the problem of space means not wanting to stop the arms race on Earth. This should be stated in clear and straight-forward terms. It is not by chance that the proponents of the nuclear arms race are also ardent supporters of the "Star Wars" program. These are the two sides of the same policy, hostile to the interests of people.

Let me turn to the European aspect of the nuclear problem. It is a matter of extreme concern that in defiance of reason and contrary to the national interests of the European peoples, American first-strike missiles continue to be deployed in certain West European countries. This problem has been under discussion for many years now. Meanwhile the security situation in Europe continues to deteriorate.

It is time to put an end to this course of events and cut this Gordian knot. The Soviet Union has for a long time been proposing that Europe should be freed from both intermediate-range and tactical nuclear weapons. This proposal remains valid. As a first radical step in this direction we are now proposing, as I have said, that even at the first stage of our program all intermediate-range ballistic and cruise missiles of the USSR and the USA in the European zone should be eliminated.

Achieving tangible practical results at the Geneva talks would give meaningful material substance to the program designed to totally eliminate nuclear arms by the year 2000, which we are proposing.

#### IV.

The Soviet Union considers as fully feasible the task of completely eliminating, even in this century, such barbaric weapons of mass destruction as chemical weapons.

At the talks on chemical weapons within the framework of the Geneva conference on disarmament certain signs of progress have recently appeared. However, these talks have been unreasonably protracted. We are in favor of intensifying the talks in order to conclude an effective and verifiable international convention prohibiting chemical weapons and destroying the existing stockpiles of those weapons, as agreed with President Reagan at Geneva.

In the matter of banning chemical weapons, just as in other disarmament matters, all participants in the talks should take a fresh look at things. I would like to make it perfectly clear that the Soviet Union is in favor of an early and complete elimination of those weapons and of the industrial base for their production. We are prepared for a timely declaration of the location of enterprises

(more)



producing chemical weapons and for the cessation of their production and ready to start developing procedures for destroying the relevant industrial base and to proceed, soon after the convention enters into force, to eliminating the stockpiles of chemical weapons. All these measures would be carried out under strict control, including international on-site inspections.

A radical solution to this problem would also be facilitated by certain interim steps. For example, agreement could be achieved on a multilateral basis not to transfer chemical weapons to anyone and not to deploy them in the territories of other states. As for the Soviet Union, it has always strictly abided by those principles in its practical policies. We call upon other states to follow that example and show equal restraint.

V.

Along with eliminating weapons of mass destruction from the arsenals of states, the Soviet Union is proposing that conventional weapons and armed forces become subject to agreed reductions.

Reaching agreement at the Vienna negotiations could signal the beginning of progress in this direction. Today it would seem that a framework is emerging for a possible decision to reduce Soviet and U.S. troops and subsequently freezing the level of armed forces of the opposing sides in Central Europe. The Soviet Union and our Warsaw Treaty allies are determined to achieve success at the Vienna Talks. If the other side also wants this, 1986 could become a landmark for the Vienna Talks too. We proceed from the understanding that a possible agreement on troop reduction would naturally require reasonable verification. We are prepared for it.

As for observing the commitment to freeze the number of troops, in addition to national technical means permanent verification posts could be established to monitor any military contingents entering the reduction zone.

Let me now mention such an important forum as the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. It is called upon to place barriers against the use of force or covert preparations for war, whether on land, at sea or in the air. The possibilities have now become evident.

In our view, especially in the current situation, it is essential to reduce the number of troops participating in major military maneuvers notifiable under the Helsinki Final Act.

It is time to begin dealing effectively with the problem still outstanding at the conference. It is known that the bottleneck there is the issue of notifications regarding major ground force, naval and air force exercises. Of course, those are serious problems and they must be addressed in a serious manner in the interests of building confidence in Europe. However, if their comprehensive solution cannot be achieved at this time, why not explore ways for their partial solution? For instance, reach agreement now about notifications of major ground force and air force exercises, postponing the question of naval activities until the next stage of the conference.

It is not an accident that the new Soviet initiatives in considerable part are directly addressed to Europe. In achieving a radical turn toward the policy of peace, Europe could have a special mission. That mission is erecting a new edifice of detente.

(more)



For this Europe has a necessary historical experience, which is often unique. Suffice it to recall that the joint efforts of the Europeans, the United States and Canada produced the Helsinki Final Act. If there is a need for a specific and vivid example of new thinking and political psychology in approaching the problems of peace, cooperation and international trust, that historic document could in many ways serve as such an example.

#### VI.

Ensuring security in Asia is of vital importance to the Soviet Union, which is a major Asian power. The Soviet program for eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of the current century is in harmony with the sentiments of the peoples of the Asian continent, for whom the problems of peace and security are no less urgent than for the peoples of Europe. In this context one cannot fail to recall that Japan and its cities Hiroshima and Nagasaki became the victims of nuclear bombing and Vietnam a target of chemical weapons.

We highly appreciate the constructive initiatives put forward by the Socialist countries of Asia and by India and other members of the nonaligned movement. We view as very important the fact that the two Asian nuclear powers, the USSR and the People's Republic of China, have both undertaken not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The implementation of our program would fundamentally change the situation in Asia, rid the nations in that part of the globe, too, of the fear of nuclear and chemical warfare, and bring the security in that region to a qualitatively new level.

We regard our program as a contribution to a search, together with all Asian countries, for an overall comprehensive approach to establishing a system of secure and durable peace in this continent.

#### VII.

Our new proposals are addressed to the whole world. Initiating active steps to halt the arms race and reduce weapons is a necessary prerequisite for coping with the increasingly acute global problems: Those of deteriorating human environment and of the need to find new energy sources and combat economic backwardness, hunger and disease. The pattern imposed by militarism--arms instead of development--must be replaced by the reverse order of things--disarmament for development. The noose of the trillion-dollar foreign debt, which is now strangling dozens of countries and entire continents, is a direct consequence of the arms race. The over two hundred and fifty billion dollars annually siphoned out of the developing countries is an amount practically equal to the size of the mammoth U.S. military budget. Indeed, this coincidence is far from accidental.

The Soviet Union wants each measure limiting and reducing arms and each step toward eliminating nuclear weapons not only to bring nations greater security but also to make it possible to allocate more funds for improving people's lives. It is natural that the peoples seeking to put an end to backwardness and achieve the level of industrially developed countries associate the prospects of freeing themselves from imperialism, the burden of foreign debt, which is draining their economies, with limiting and eliminating weapons, reducing military expenditures and switching resources to the goals of social and economic development. This theme will undoubtedly figure most prominently at the international conference on disarmament and development to be held next summer in Paris.

(more)



The Soviet Union is opposed to making the implementation of disarmament measures dependent on the so-called regional conflicts. Behind this dependency is both the unwillingness to follow the path of disarmament and the desire to impose upon sovereign nations what is alien to them and what would make it possible to maintain profoundly unfair conditions whereby some countries live at the expense of others, exploiting their natural, human and spiritual resources for the selfish imperial purposes of certain states or aggressive alliances. The Soviet Union, as before, will continue to oppose this. It will continue consistently to advocate freedom for the world's peoples, peace, security, and a stronger international legal order. The Soviet Union's goal is not to whip up regional conflicts but to eliminate them through collective efforts on a just basis, and the sooner the better.

Today, there is no shortage of statements professing commitment to peace. What is really in short supply is concrete action to strengthen its foundations. All too often peaceful words conceal war preparations and power politics. Moreover, some statements made from high rostrums are in fact intended to eliminate any contribution of that new "spirit of Geneva" which is having a salutary effect on international relations today. It is not only a matter of statements. There are also actions clearly designed to incite animosity and mistrust and to revive confrontation, which is antithetical to detente.

We reject such a way of acting and thinking. We want 1986 to be not just a peaceful year but one that would enable us to reach the end of the twentieth century under the sign of peace and nuclear disarmament. The set of new foreign policy initiatives that we are proposing is intended to make it possible for humanity to approach the year 2000 under peaceful skies and with peaceful space, without fear of nuclear, chemical or any other threat of annihilation and fully confident of its own survival and of the continuation of the human race.

The new resolute measures now taken by the Soviet Union for the sake of peace and of improving the overall international situation give expression to the substance and the spirit of our internal and foreign policies and their organic unity. They reflect the fundamental historic law which was emphasized by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. The whole world sees that our country is holding the banner of peace high. Freedom and humanism is raised over our planet by the Great October Revolution.

On the questions of preserving peace and saving humanity from the threat of nuclear war, no one should remain indifferent or stand aloof. This concerns all and everyone. Each state, large or small, socialist or capitalist, has an important contribution to make. Every responsible political party, every social organization and every person can also make an important contribution.

No task is more urgent, more noble and humane, than uniting all efforts to achieve this lofty goal. This task is to be accomplished by our generation without shifting it onto the shoulders of those who will succeed us. This is the imperative of our time. This, I would say, is the burden of historic responsibility for our decisions and actions in the time remaining until the beginning of the Third Millennium.

The course of peace and disarmament will continue to be pivotal to the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. In actively pursuing this course, the Soviet Union is prepared to engage in wide-ranging cooperation with all those who stand on positions of reason, good will and an awareness of responsibility for assuring the human race a future without wars or weapons.